Studia Slavica Hung. 59/1 (2014) 93–112
DOI: 10.1556/SSlav.59.2014.1.9

The Newly Identified Latin Prototype of the Marian Homilies of Jan of Szamotuły

ROMAN MAZURKIEWICZ
Instytut Filologii Polskiej, Uniwersytet Pedagogiczny, Podchorążych 2, PL-30-084 Kraków
E-mail: mazurk@up.krakow.pl

(Received: 12 January 2014; accepted: 27 March 2014)

Abstract: In the present paper, the Latin source of the Marian Sermons written by Jan of Szamotuły (c. 1480–1519) is identified and discussed. The collection of Sermons, survived in a manuscript dated to the early 16th century, consists of a number of texts concerning the Immaculate Conception, the Nativity, the Holy Name, and the Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Although closely related to medieval scholastic treatises in their structure and theological content, the Sermons were generally believed to be Jan of Szamotuły's own work. However, the author of this paper argues that the actual source of this collection was a volume of sermons *Stellarium coronae Benedictae Mariae Virginis* written by the Hungarian Franciscan Pelbárt of Temesvár (c. 1435–1504). The two texts are compared with a view of identifying the characteristic features of the Polish translation. The paper also discusses some issues concerning the date and circumstances of the creation of the collection of Sermons.

Keywords: Jan of Szamotuły, Pelbárt of Temesvár, medieval sermons, Virgin Mary, immaculate conception

One of the most treasured items in the Polish early 16th-century theological and homiletic writings is a collection of Marian sermons attributed to Jan of Szamotuły who still in his lifetime earned the pen-name Paterek ("Little Father"). The sermons of Paterek (*Kazania Paterka*) survive in a manuscript copy which was discovered well-nigh 140 years ago. Their author's name and the conventional title of his oeuvre have established themselves firmly in the textbooks and anthologies of Old Polish literature. A number of salient studies on the linguistic, historical and literary, and theological aspects of *Kazania Paterka* have been published, yet there are still many questions relating to these sermons which have not received fully satisfactory answers.

Jan of Szamotuły, the son of Maciej, was born around 1480 into a family of townsfolk settled in Greater Poland. In 1500, his name was entered in the register of students at the University of Kraków. His guardian at the time was his countryman, Wojciech Krypa of Szamotuły, astronomer and physician to Queen Elizabeth. In 1502, Jan obtained the baccalaureate; and the degree of Master of the Liberal Arts was conferred on him in 1504. After graduating, he entered the Order of the Franciscans of the Strict Observance in Kraków; however, he soon left the novitiate, and started lecturing in philosophy, poetics, and epistolography at the University in 1506, where he had the status of a *professor extraneus*. One of his scholarly

0039-3363/$ 25.00 © 2014 Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest

activities was commentary on the works of Aristotle and on the correspondence of Francesco Filelfo with his student Jan of Oświęcim (Ioannes Sacranus). At the same time, he embarked on a course of study in Canon Law, and obtained the title of Doctor of Decrees in 1513. As of 1506, he preached in St. Anne's Church in Kraków, and perhaps also in the Cathedral. As a university professor he was prebendary of the village of Pobiódr in the District of Wadowice. He died on Sunday, 9 January 1519, slain by one Rusocki, lord of the village of Rusosice near Czernichów, where he had gone to claim the tithes due to him from Rusocki. The murder was notorious enough to be recorded in two Cracovian calendars. He was buried on 21 January in the Carmelite Church of St Mary's-in-Arena in Kraków (TASZYCKI 1962–1963, NK 1965: 304–305, FRANKOWSKA 1999: 18).

The Marian homilies attributed to Paterek have been preserved in just one hitherto discovered copy, made in 1523–1525 by one scribe, who was probably fairly young and had received his education in the 16th century.[1] Shortly after he had finished his work (before 1527), it was checked, amended, and supplemented with a commentary by someone who was his senior and most probably in Holy Orders, as indicated by the typically 15th-century hand.[2] The codex containing this copy of the Paterek sermons was compiled in Kraków but it was transferred in unknown circumstances to Toruń, where it was discovered for modern scholarship in the library of the local grammar school (*gimnazjum*) by Wojciech Kętrzyński, who in 1874 published news of his discovery and of the author of its homiletic contents (KĘTRZYŃSKI 1874). A few years later Lucjan Malinowski published a transliteration of the entire manuscript (MALINOWSKI 1880).

According to Kętrzyński, seven homilies could be identified in the Toruń collection, each concluded by the word "Amen". However, since Malinowski's edition, the standard practice has been to single out three homilies of diverse lengths in the manuscript. They are as follows: I. On the Conception of the Pure Virgin Mary (*O poczęciu Panny Maryjej Czystej*, f.1–18v), II. On the Conception of the Most Pure Virgin Mary (*O poczęciu Przenaczystszej Dziewice Panny Maryjej*, f.19r–86v), and III. On the Nativity of the Virgin Mary (*O narodzeniu Maryjej Panny*, f.87r–154v) (MALINOWSKI 1880: 5–6; folio numbering after the Malinowski edition). Although Malinowski wrote of three sermons beginning with the above "titles", he noted that in the final part of the manuscript there was more than just Sermon III (On the Nativity of the Virgin Mary), that she was elected by God and sanctified in her mother's womb, followed by an account of her birth and of her privileges. He observed that this sermon ended with the word "Amen" on f.115v, while what came on the subsequent leaves of the manuscript consisted of "a description of the forms and parts of the Blessed Virgin Mary" (f.115v–123v), an

[1] It is a paper codex of 154 leaves and dimensions 21.8 × 16.0 cm, now in the collections of the Książnica Kopernikańska in Toruń (signature № R. IV. 26).

[2] Maria Frankowska writes of two proof-readers. The first used red ink and only made minor amendments; the second used black ink and made more profound and resolute changes in the text, some of them smacking of the "censor", putting in marks which may indicate that the text was being revised for delivery (FRANKOWSKA 1999: 19–20).

account of the names and epithets of the Blessed Virgin Mary (f.124r–134v), and "the Blessed Virgin Mary's life, virtues, and holiness" (MALINOWSKI 1880: 6).

In 1958, the linguist Maria Karpluk published a meticulous study on the language and style of the Paterek sermons, formulating a series of key issues and questions concerning the coherence of the collection and the authorship of the sermons inscribed in it (KARPLUK 1958: 79–91, KARPLUK 2010: 117–166). As she remarked, the note which appears at the end of Sermon I, "Dr. Paterek's sermon, in which he humbly asks you for a 'Hail Mary' for the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, has just ended" ("Już się dokonało kazanie doktora Paterka, gdzież prosi pokornie o Zdrową Maryją dla naczystszego poczęcia Panny Maryjej"), has no bearing on the authorship of the remaining sermons. The question whether Jan of Szamotuły was the author of all three sermons extant in the Toruń manuscript, or just the one or, perhaps, two of them had neither been put hitherto nor resolved (cf. KARPLUK 2010: 117).

Karpluk's point of departure for the analysis of the language of the Toruń codex was the assumption that Sermon I was "certainly the work of Paterek, albeit in a copy", while the remaining sermons, although transcribed in the same collection, need not have been by him at all (KARPLUK 2010: 117–118). Taking into account the copyist's potential influence on the features shared by all the components of the collection, her comparative analysis of the language of the three sermons as regards phonology, word-formation, inflection, lexical choice, style, and selection of source materials for the arguments put forward in the sermons led her to the conclusion that Sermon II clearly differed in terms of language and style from Sermons I and III, which were overtly related in this respect:

> Is the entire literary monument known as the Paterek Sermons the work of Paterek? The answer turns out to be "no". Differences have come to light between Sermon II and the rest of the manuscript comprising Paterek's original homily (Sermon I) and the extensive anonymous Sermon III… In the light of the data I have presented above, it appears we may attribute Sermon III to Jan of Szamotuły, who was the author of Sermon I; however, the author of Sermon II was some other person, whose identity may perhaps be determined by a search through potential sources (KARPLUK 2010: 147).

Karpluk's conclusions were adopted, albeit cautiously, by Teresa Michałowska, who wrote that if the Toruń codex was neither the work of a single author, nor of three different writers, then we should say that the authorship of Sermon III, rather than of Sermon II, should be ascribed to Paterek, the author of Sermon I (MICHAŁOWSKA 1995: 628). Elsewhere, Michałowska writes that we may conjecture that, apart from Sermon I, only Sermon III is the work of Paterek, while somebody else could have been the author of Sermon II (MICHAŁOWSKA 2011: 420). This opinion is shared by the editors of the homiletic fragments in the Toruń codex, who write that Sermon I and probably Sermon III were the work of Paterek, while Sermon II presumably came from another author's pen (RZEPKA–WYDRA 1984: 100, RZEPKA–WYDRA 1996: 125).

Like Malinowski before, Michałowska also observed a lack of coherence in the composition and contents of Sermon III, suggesting that there might be a fourth sermon which starts on f.115v with the words "Now I want to finish [the discourse] on the birth of the Virgin Mary and start [a new one on] the wonderful vessel created by the Highest" ("Chcę zamknąć o narodzeniu Panny Maryjej i zakładam początek: Sąd dziwny uczynek Nawyższego"). According to Michałowska, it consists of three parts: a description of Mary (f.115v–123v), a discussion of her names and epithets (f.124r–134v), and an account of her life (f.134v–154v), in which the writer addresses women (perhaps nuns?), asking them to imitate Mary's life (Michałowska 1995: 628–629, Michałowska 2011: 400, 419–420). Hence, we should conclude that the Toruń codex contains not three but four sermons (Michałowska 1995: 629). Moreover, the fourth sermon deserves special notice, in the opinion of Michałowska, because its opening passage contains a description of Mary's beauty adapted from the treatise *De laudibus Beatae Mariae Virginis* attributed to Albert the Great (Michałowska 1995: 630). Another researcher who has remarked on the material that follows Sermon III is Maria Adamczyk, calling it "a sort of annex" coming after the *clausio* to Sermon III, a new subject supplementing the main homiletic matter of the sermon on the Nativity of the Virgin Mary (Adamczyk 1980: 125).

The sermons in the Toruń codex, especially I and II, focus on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which excited heated debate at the turn of the 15th and 16th centuries, while at the same time gaining more and more popularity. Pope Sixtus IV's promulgation of the bull *Grave nimis* on 5 September 1482 anathemising the doctrine's opponents activated immaculatists throughout Europe. In 1497, the University of Paris made it obligatory for candidates for the award of an academic degree to take an oath to defend the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Soon, other universities followed the example of Paris. The position of those who defended the doctrine was enhanced in the University of Kraków as well (Kopeć 1997: 228, Fijałek 1900). This was an auspicious situation for the growth of indigenous theological, homiletic, and literary work disseminating the doctrine, and its most fervent propagators were the Franciscans (and in Poland, especially the Franciscans of the Strict Observance). Composed in Polish, Paterek's sermons may be considered the epitome of Polish immaculatist lore, as a researcher of the history of the Marian devotions, Father Jerzy Józef Kopeć has remarked, suggesting that a potential influence on Paterek's homiletic work may have come from Bernardino de Bustis' *Mariale*, a collection of 63 Marian sermons and the new Office of the Immaculate Conception approved by the Holy See (Kopeć 1997: 229–230).

All the scholars who have examined the Toruń codex agree that the sermons in it take the form of erudite scholastic treatises presenting the subject according to a precisely defined and accomplished scheme. Each begins with a quote from the Scriptures setting out the subject, then follows with its introduction and development in an extensive series of issues or points, usually in a numbered arrangement, finally leading to a conclusion, prayer, and pious exhortation (Adamczyk 1980: 124–125). All the sermons make numerous references to ecclesiastical authorities,

and far less often to "pagan" writers, relying on biblical and patristic arguments alongside points drawn from speculative theology, history, and the liturgy, and occasionally exempla, on the one hand, to illustrate Mary's unfaltering protection for those who honour her Immaculate Conception, and, on the other, to warn of the dangers looming ahead for the doctrine's opponents and detractors.

Sermon I, which has generally been acknowledged as the work of Paterek, is clearly addressed to the intellectual requirements and expectations of the "learned" recipient, and approaches the theological issues involved in accordance with the conventions of academic literature. It has the features of university discourse (cf. MICHAŁOWSKA 1995: 629). Frankowska remarks on the skill with which the author of Sermon I uses language and organises his composition, and writes that Paterek must have acquired his literary adroitness by reading his often-cited philosophers and Fathers and Doctors of the Church, thereby proving his erudition and wide experience as a reader of numerous authors (though she has second thoughts – maybe he availed himself of a medieval compendium of quotations?) (FRANKOWSKA 1999: 23). The exceptionally abundant schedule of sources invoked by Paterek had already been observed by the pre-war scholar of early Polish literature and culture, Aleksander Brückner, who nonetheless spiced this observation with a mischievous comment that Father Paterek was neither a *lumen Ecclesiae*, nor too much of a man of learning, adding that he would not care to check all of Paterek's references, many of which were pure make-believe, since sundry works or passages he cited simply did not exist (BRÜCKNER 1900: 76–77).

Brückner was probably the only one of all the commentators of the Paterek sermons I have referred to so far to consider their authenticity:

> Is the work original, or was it translated from Latin? At first sight it definitely looks like a translation; its word order, phraseology, and most of all its weird etymologies seem to make this an inevitability (BRÜCKNER 1900: 77).

According to Brückner, it is all the etymologising in the Paterek sermons that indicates they may have been derived from a Latin model, since the etymological explanations would only make sense in the medium of Latin. However, he soon abandons this path of enquiry:

> Despite the shocking Latinisms, I have no hesitations in declaring these sermons the original work of Father Paterek. The fact that I have not found an original Latin text does not necessarily prove anything in view of the vast legacy of mediaeval writings in this field. Nonetheless, just as a Czech influence on the spelling or vocabulary in a Polish text need not necessarily mean that the work came from a Czech prototype, so, too, even the most drastic Latinisms need not testify to a Latin origin. Who wrote these sermons, anyway? A learned master, a doctor of decrees, who for years had been using Latin to teach, pray, write, and think; who only read works in Latin; who found it a hundred times harder to grapple with the uncouth Polish language than to write in accordance with the readymade Latin formulae; who thought in Latin as he endeavoured to write in Polish! Thus, the Latinisms are not evidence against the originality of Paterek's opus, unless we were to say that he was translating his own Latinity into Polish (BRÜCKNER 1900: 78).

As this overview of the current state of research shows, the matter of authenticity is the question put least often regarding the texts in the enigmatic Toruń codex. The addition "Here endeth the sermon of Dr Paterek" at the end of Sermon I effectively neutralised any doubts and misgivings researchers may have had as to the authorship not only of Sermon I itself but also to its sequel in Sermon III, germane in terms of language and style. Reservations on Paterek's authorship have been voiced only with respect to Sermon II, which stands apart not only for its linguistic and stylistic features but also for its less constrained composition and greater expressiveness. Nevertheless, there has been tacit acceptance of the opinion of Lucjan Malinowski, the pioneer in editing the Sermons, who declared outright that these sermons on the Blessed Virgin were an original Polish work, not translations from a foreign language (MALINOWSKI 1880: 8).

* * *

For the time being, I am going to put aside the authorship issue and potential sources of Sermon II, which Paterek does not appear to have authored, as Maria Karpluk has demonstrated and as most of the researchers concede. Evidently, the copyist of the Toruń codex inserted another author's sermon into the collection he was transcribing, putting it just after Sermon I, no doubt because of its immaculatist subject, since both treat of the conception of the Virgin Mary. Nonetheless, this issue calls for more research, especially the examination of sources.

However, already now we can say that Sermons I and III, hitherto regarded as Paterek's original work, are almost entirely translations of passages from the collection *Stellarium coronae Benedictae Mariae Virginis in laudem eius pro singulis praedicationibus elegantissime coaptatum*, which was written by the Hungarian Franciscan Pelbárt of Temesvár and published for the first time in 1496. Incidentally, Pelbárt was also a graduate of the University of Kraków, like Paterek, but his senior by two generations.

Pelbárt of Temesvár (Temesvári Pelbárt, Pelbartus Temesvariensis) was one of the most outstanding representatives of the Franciscan school of theology and homiletics in the second half of the 15th century.[3] We do not know much about his life. He was born around 1435 in Temesvár, Hungary (present-day Timişoara in Romania), and presumably completed his elementary education there. In 1458, he entered his name, as *Gewardus Ladislai de Themeschwar*, in the students' register at the University of Kraków (CHMIEL–ŻEGOTA 1887: 153). He obtained the degree of Bachelor of the Liberal Arts in 1463 (MUCZKOWSKI 1849: 59, GĄSIOROWSKI 2000: 53), and most probably he entered the Franciscan Order at about this time.

[3] For Pelbárt's biography and an account of his work see KOSZTOLNYIK 1967: 100–110, KOSZTOLNYIK 1988: 5–18, and ÁDÁM 2008. Pelbárt's theological and homiletic works are being systematically transcribed and made accessible online in the admirable Sermones compilati project (http://sermones.elte.hu) jointly conducted by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund and Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE). The project has also published online several papers on Pelbárt, compiled for the seminars and workshops on Hungarian late medieval homiletics.

According to some of his biographers, he continued his studies in Kraków and obtained a doctorate in theology in 1471; however, these conjectures are not substantiated by the sources. Nevertheless, it is beyond dispute that he was professor of theology in the *studium generale* of the Franciscan Convent of St. John the Evangelist in Buda in 1483, and commented on the *Sententiae* of Peter Lombard. He died in Buda on 22 January 1504.

Pelbárt was acclaimed throughout Europe as the author of four Latin works, which appeared in print at the turn of the 15th and 16th centuries. His collection of model sermons entitled *Stellarium coronae Benedictae Mariae Virginis* composed from 1480 to 1483 and published many times in various cities including Strasburg (1496) and Hagenau (1498) became extremely popular.[4] In its prologue, Pelbárt declares that the incentive to write it came from a vow he made to the Virgin Mary thanks to whose intercession he survived the plague from 1479 to 1481.

Pelbárt's second work in chronological order was *Expositio compendiosa et familiaris sensum litteralem et mysticum complectens Libri Psalmorum…*, his commentary to the Book of Psalms, which he wrote from 1483 to 1487, and published in Strasbourg in 1487. His third work was *Pomerium* (The Orchard), consisting of three volumes of sermons he composed over eighteen years (1489–1497). The three volumes contain a total of around 500 homilies arranged in three cycles: on the Saints (*Pomerium de sanctis*), for holy days (*Pomerium de tempore*), and for Lent (*Sermones quadragesimales*). There are no Marian sermons in the collection; Pelbárt's Marian sermons were put into the *Stellarium coronae*, to which he refers interested readers in the preface to the *Pomerium.*

Pelbárt's last opus, which he started in 1500, was *Aureum sacrae theologiae Rosarium iuxta quattuor Sententiarum libros pariformiter quadripartitum*, his encyclopaedically arranged commentary to the works of Duns Scotus. The third and fourth volumes of the *Rosarium* were compiled by Pelbárt's student and friend Osvát Laskai (Osvaldus de Lasko).

As he writes, Pelbárt composed these works to provide a range of pastoral materials for preachers, especially for his confreres as well as for the needs of his students. His homilies were to serve as model examples of the practical application of the rules of *ars predicandi*. In the prologue to the *Pomerium*, Pelbárt sets down guidelines on how to use the collection, writing that some passages in the sermons could be elaborated, others omitted or simplified according to the preacher's needs and the receptive faculties of his audience. He supplies his readers with a useful aid: a set of graphically highlighted questions and conclusions (and, in addition, marginal notes in the *Stellarium*), to help preachers quickly find their way around

[4] Later editions: Basel, 1497–1500; Hagenau, 1501, 1504, 1505, 1508, 1509, 1520; Strasbourg, 1502, 1506; Lyon, 1509, 1514 (see SZILÁDY 1880: 55). There is one copy of the 1505 edition of the *Stellarium coronae* and two copies of the 1509 edition in the Jagiellonian Library collection in Kraków. In the archives of the Cracovian Province of the Franciscans of the Strict Observance, there are copies of eight editions of the *Stellarium coronae* published before 1518. The one with the most handwritten marginalia, showing that it must have been closely read, is a copy of the 1498 Hagenau edition (shelf mark XV. 343).

the arrangement of the material and its contents. Another reader's guide to his works are the alphabetical indices (labelled as "Tabula alphabetica" in the *Stellarium*) to the contents. Alongside reference to collections of examples, lives of the saints, and florilegia, the use of collections of model sermons was the basic method medieval preachers employed to facilitate and speed up the composition of their homilies (ROUSE 1979).

The *Stellarium coronae* consists of twelve books, each divided into several parts each of which contain three articles. The articles are subdivided into graphically detached chapters which in later editions are numbered along the margins. Each of these twelve books has been arranged in accordance with the scholastic scheme *verba thematis – prothema – divisio/subdivisio – dilatatio – unitio – clausio*, with distinctions and sub-distinctions making up a network of multi-level constructions presented in an enumerative order (BRACHA 2007: 92–96). Hence, what Pelbárt's *Stellarium* offers is not so much a typical set of ready-made sermons available for immediate delivery, as a collection of materials arranged in the manner of medieval theological treatises for individual use in the composition of sermons for particular Marian feast-days.

All the books and homilies in the *Stellarium* are based on the principle that Mary was assumed into heaven with body and soul, and that she is the dispenser of graces from God to mankind. This doctrine is illustrated by the twelve stars in her crown in the Apocalypse, and in the *Stellarium* by the twelve homilies on her feasts and mysteries. These are as follows: I. The Annunciation and Incarnation; II. The Visitation; III. The Purification; IV. The Immaculate Conception; V. The Nativity; VI. Her Name; VII. Her Life; VIII. Her Virginity; IX. Her Love; X. The Assumption; XI. Mary's Dignity and Privileges; XII. The Veneration Due to Mary.

In the preface to the *Stellarium*, Pelbárt writes that his humble aim is to help "preachers who are not so proficient," and that is why he has used a simple language and a simple style, offering a selection of contents limited to matters which may be of use for the instruction of "simple folk".[5] By availing himself of Pelbárt's collection, making a selection from its materials and putting together his chosen extracts, Paterek was doing precisely what Pelbárt had laid down in his instructions for the pragmatic application of his work. The resulting Polish sermons which were later recorded in the Toruń codex are probably the earliest translation of passages drawn from Pelbárt's *Stellarium* into a vernacular language.[6]

* * *

The detailed analysis of the relation of Paterek's translation to its Latin prototype would call for a separate study, especially as regards language and style. Here, I shall limit myself merely to an outline of the main features in the text and

[5] *Prologus*, f. a_2r. I am using the 1505 Hagenau edition, denoting it as SC in further references.

[6] The earliest Hungarian translation of the extracts from Pelbart's *Stellarium coronae* is in the Trnava Codex (1512–1513) (see SZILÁDY1880: 60–63).

composition of the two sermons (I and III) in the Toruń codex traditionally attributed Paterek indicative of his dependence on Pelbárt's collection. I omit Sermon III, which is independent of the *Stellarium*.

Sermon I. On the Conception of the Pure Virgin Mary

The whole of this sermon, transcribed on f.1–18v of the Toruń manuscript, was compiled from translations of large passages from Book IV of the *Stellarium coronae*, entitled *De immaculata conceptione Mariae*. These passages come from Articles 1–3 of Part One and Articles 1 and 3 of Part Two. Paterek omitted the brief introductory note on the structure of the sermon and started his translation from the passage in the original text beginning with the words "Tota pulchra es, amica, et macula non est in te" (Song of Songs 4,7). Already in his rendering of this verse from the Scriptures Paterek demonstrates his meticulous attention to accuracy in quotes from the Bible, amending any phrases abbreviated or inaccurately cited (perhaps from memory) in his Latin original. Here Paterek is fastidious enough to reinstate the Polish word *moja* for the Vulgate's *mea*, missing in Pelbárt's citation. Paterek's version is "You are all beautiful, my friend, and there is no stain in you" ("Wszytka cudna jesteś, przyjaciołko moja, a zmaza nie jest w tobie"; P 1r).[7] Next Paterek summarises Pelbárt's three arguments to justify the use of the phrase "friend of God" with reference to Mary, which he calls the three glories of Mary.

The next section of Pelbárt's sermon enumerates the three mysteries of the Virgin Mary's immaculate conception, which are to be discussed in the three questions making up Part One of the sermon:

> Primum mysterium dicitur celebritatis.
> Secundum dicitur immunitatis.
> Tertium dicitur probabilitatis (SC b_5v).

I am quoting this list because Paterek notoriously fails to reproduce the numeration in Pelbárt's lists, which are a key component in the structure of the original sermons, thereby putting his Polish readers at risk of losing their way in the resultant jumble of lists from Pelbárt's *divisio* and *subdivisio* levels. This is what happens here: having ignored the arrangement of the question in point form and the short commentary to it, Paterek comes up with the sentence "And here I put the first question: why do they celebrate the feast of the Virgin Mary?" ("A tu pierwsze pytanie czynię: czemu święcą święto Maryjej Panny?"), which is a paraphrase of part of the heading to Article I in Pelbárt's sermon, "Quod festum conceptionis Mariae ab omnibus est celebrandum et ad id inducunt plures utilitates" (SC b_5v).

[7] My notation for quotes from the Toruń manuscript is P (= Paterek), followed by the number of the folio (after Malinowski's pagination).

Paterek reiterates the alleged cause of the celebration of Mary's conception given by Pelbárt: "I reply: to the simple people, who think that St. Anne conceived by St. Joachim kissing her, that it is not true" ("Odpowiedam, iż dla ludzi prostych, ktorzy mnimają, iżby Anna święta przez pocałowanie świętego Joachima poczęła, co nie jest prawda"). The original sentence in Pelbárt's sermon reads "Et non est verum, quod simplices putant, scilicet Annam concepisse per solum osculum Ioachim" (SC b_5v). It may be readily observed that Paterek's application of this sentence as an "answer" to the question which has been put, why the feast of Mary's conception is celebrated, is at odds with Pelbárt's intention in this sentence, which was to present the arguments of "our doctors" on this issue. Whereas Pelbárt devotes a substantial amount of attention and effort to this point, Paterek ignores it completely. He also omits the next list, of the four reasons why devout Christians celebrate the feast of Mary's conception, limiting himself merely to a curt statement: "Which feast we are to celebrate for four reasons", corresponding to the original "Festum conceptionis Mariae debet quilibet devote celebrare propter quattuor praecipua inductiva" ("Ktore święto mamy święcić dla czwiorakiej rzeczy"; SC b_6r).

In the rest of Sermon I Paterek makes use of virtually the whole of the text of Articles I and II of Part One of Pelbárt's sermon, and twelve of the arguments (*wywody*) in Article III to substantiate the doctrine that the Virgin was conceived free of original sin: "iż Panna przez grzechu pierworodnego jest poczęta" (P 7r). He skips a series of theological arguments to support the claim that Mary was free of original sin and a few of the exempla from the end of Article III. He is far more selective in what he takes from Part Two of Pelbárt's sermon. First he avails himself of Article III, reproducing a mention of Sixtus IV's bull and seven of the arguments for the veneration of Mary the Immaculate Conception. Next he returns to Article I,[8] taking individual sentences from it to explain what is meant by "original sin", who is subject to it and when. The corresponding passage in Pelbárt comprises seven "truths" about original sin, reproduced from the works of Franciscus Maronis (Francis of Meyronnes). Paterek passes over the whole of the more speculative Article III, which addresses seven problems concerning the mystery of Mary's conception. His Sermon I concludes with two prayers. The first is a paraphrase of the antiphon *Salve Regina*, not drawn from his Latin prototype; while the second is a faithful translation of the prayer concluding Pelbárt's fourth sermon.

Even a cursory comparison of the text of Paterek's Sermon I with Pelbárt's fourth sermon is enough to demonstrate that the Polish translator made liberal use of his prototype. Usually he translated a given passage of the Latin original *in extenso*; sometimes, but less frequently he employed paraphrase or synopsis of fairly short passages; while other passages, occasionally even several pages long, he would omit completely. The passages omitted tended to be those which presented the opinions and arguments put forward by medieval defenders of the immaculate conception, and those which contained enumerations organising the development of the sermon.

[8] Perhaps, the leaves of the manuscript from which the copyist was transcribing the Toruń codex had been put in the wrong order.

Sermon III. On the Nativity of the Virgin Mary

The relationship between Sermon III, hitherto regarded as Paterek's work (f.87r–154v in the Toruń manuscript), and the *Stellarium coronae* is far more complex, since what we have in fact are three sermons, not one. They are as follows:

On the Nativity of the Virgin Mary
[On the Blessed Name of the Virgin Mary]
[On the Most Holy Life of the Virgin Mary]

The first, On the Nativity of the Virgin Mary (f.87r–123v), is a translation of passages from Book V of the *Stellarium*, entitled *De mysterio sanctissimae nativitatis Benedictae Virginis Mariae*. The Polish sermon begins with a heading defining its subject: "I base this work on King David's Psalm 906 [!] from the Psalter: Light came unto the just man, and joy unto the simple hearts" ("Zakładam ono pismo w Żołtarzu psalma dziewięćsetnego [!] i szostego świętego króla Dawida: Światłość weszła jest sprawiedliwemu, a ludziem prostego serca wiesiele"), like Part One of Pelbárt's sermon, the difference being that Paterek omitted the short introductory account of the sermon's three parts (SC i_6v). Paterek continues by piecing his sermon together out of large passages translated from Part One of Pelbárt's sermon (Articles I–III), adopting nearly the whole of Chapter 4 of Article I, which lists Mary's twelve "customs" corresponding to the twelve stars in her crown. Paterek translates Article II, *De sanctificatione Beatae Mariae in utero suae matris*, with only a few minor omissions; his translation of Article III, *De revelatione temporalis facta a Deo multipliciter…*, which describes twelve "temporal revelations" associated with the birth of Mary, leaves out slightly more of the original text, notably the initial list of the twelve revelations, which are arranged in the original in three groups of four.

Paterek omits the introduction and Article I (*Specialiter de nativitate Beatae Mariae Virginis*) of Pelbárt's Part Two, which presents the prophetic figures (the dawn, moon, and sun) relating to the birth of Mary. He uses about half of Article II, *De XII privilegiis, quibus Beata Maria est honorata et gloriose dignificata in sua sancta nativitate* (SC k_5r), which in Paterek's text has a heading "I wish to write that at her birth Mary received twelve privileges, four on the part of her body, four on the part of her soul, and four on the part of both body and soul" ("Chcę pisać, iż dwanaście przywilejow wzięła Maryja przy swym narodzeniu; bo z strony ciała czterzy a z strony duszy czterzy, z strony duszy i ciała czterzy"; P 107v). This time the translator keeps the division of the twelve privileges into three quarterns ("ex parte corporis habuit quattuor privilegia, ex parte animae similiter quattuor, et ex parte utriusque simul iterum quattuor"; SC k_5r); nonetheless, he obliterates their connection with the twelve stars in Mary's crown which the original describes. He gives a brief account of the four "joys" occasioned by Mary's birth as described in Pelbárt's Article III, but leaves out both the heading to the article as well as the list of the four joys which Pelbárt presents in point form.

Part Three of Pelbárt's homily on the birth of Mary is entitled *De nascentis Mariae admirabili conditione*. As I have already said, both Lucjan Malinowski and Teresa Michałowska suspected that a new, fourth sermon by Paterek started on f.115v of the Toruń manuscript, as indicated by the words "Now I want to finish [the discourse] on the birth of the Virgin Mary and start [a new one on] "The wonderful vessel, creation of the Highest" ("Chcę zamknąć o narodzeniu Panny Maryjej i zakładam początek: Sąd dziwny, uczynek Nawyższego"). However, in view of the strict dependence of Paterek's homily on Pelbárt's sermon it has to be stressed that what we have here is not a new sermon but just the next part of the sermon on the birth of the Virgin Mary. One of the topics it presents is Mary's physical beauty. Passing over the closing lines of Part Two, Article III, which contains a few examples of the Virgin's miraculous interventions, Paterek (or his copyist) inserted the word "Amen" after the prayer translated from the Latin source, ahead of the description of the miracles, and proceeded to Part Three of Pelbárt's sermon, which has a heading defining a new subject, "Vas admirabile, opus Excelsi" (Sirah 43:2). Thus Paterek's expression of an intention to close his deliberations on the Virgin's birth means he is concluding the question on the mystery of Mary's birth and moving on to his next topic, which is a laudation of the "result" of her birth, the "wonderful vessel, creation of the Highest" – Mary's spiritual and physical beauty.

Paterek's use of the eulogy of the miraculously born Mary in Part Three of Pelbárt's sermon is differentiated. He takes only sporadic sections of Article I, *De ipsius animae Mariae admirabilis celsitudine*, *qua est a Deo condita*; but translates virtually the whole of Article II, *De admirabilis pulchritudine et decore Beatae Mariae ex parte corporis*, *tam in quantitate*, *quam in colore et membrorum elegantia*. This is the detailed description of Mary's bodily beauty, based on the treatise *De laudibus Beatae Mariae Virginis* formerly attributed to Albert the Great,[9] which for a long time has attracted the attention of Paterek scholars. Now it turns out that Paterek's access was mediated by the *Stellarium coronae*. This passage is followed in Pelbárt, and after him in Paterek as well, by an account of the Blessed Virgin's customs and conduct, and a story from Johann Herolt's *Promptuarium exemplorum Discipuli*, about a student from Paris who was willing to risk losing his sight in order to admire the praeternatural beauty of the Blessed Virgin.

At this point the Polish text of the sermon on the birth of Mary comes to an abrupt end, while Pelbárt's sermon continues with another example followed by Article III, on the twelve supernatural graces God bestowed on Mary, closing with a prayer to Our Lady for her intercession. We may assume that this transcription of the sermons of Paterek was done posthumously and the copyist was working from an incomplete manuscript (perhaps the autograph?), with a couple of the middle leaves missing. This conjecture is borne out by the text beginning on f.124r of the Toruń manuscript – its opening sentence is beyond doubt derived from Pelbárt's next sermon, moreover, from its middle part.

[9] See Albertus Magnus: *De laudibus Beatae Mariae Virginis libri duodecim* (Lib. IV, Cap. 2. *De corporali pulchritudine Maria*) (cf. BORGNET 1898). In fact, this work was written by the 13th-century French theologian Richard of St. Laurent, editio princeps 1473.

Sermon IV. [On the Blessed Name of the Virgin Mary]

I have reconstructed the heading of this sermon, which occupies f.124r–132r in the Toruń codex, on the basis of the title of Book VI of Pelbárt's *Stellarium coronae*, *De benedicto nomine Mariae*. The first sentence on f.124r shows that this is a new sermon with its opening leaves missing in the transcription. It reads „The eleventh benefit drawn from calling on the name of Mary is the cooling of the fire of purgatory…" ("Jedennasny pożytek z wzywania tego imienia Maryja jest ochłodzenie ognia czyśćcowego…"). Evidently, at least an account of the first ten "benefits" are missing.

In the *Stellarium*, the sermon entitled *De benedicto nomine Mariae* comprises two parts: "Prima est de excellentia, sublimitate nominis Mariae" and "Secunda de gloriositate nominis eiusdem Benedictae Virginis Mariae" (SC l_2v). In Article I of Pelbárt's Part One of this sermon, he discusses three mysteries associated with Mary's name, elevating it above all other names; while in Article II, he derives five of Mary's special virtues from the five letters of her name. There is no trace of either of these articles in the extant transcript of Paterek's sermon. Pelbárt's Article III is of special relevance for us; in it he presents twelve benefits accruing from calling on the name of Mary. "The eleventh benefit drawn from calling on the name of Mary is the cooling of the fire of purgatory…" is Paterek's translation of Pelbárt's "Undecima utilitas: purgatorii ignis refrigeratio…" (SC l_6r). Presumably, the absence of the first ten "benefits" in the manuscript which he was transcribing must have confused the copyist and made him lose his bearings, since he changed Pelbárt's numeration, calling the twelfth benefit "Drugi pożytek" (the second benefit), despite having numbered the previous one – the first in Paterek's version of the sermon – "the eleventh".

Out of Part Two of Pelbárt's sermon his Polish translator missed out the initial register of the three mysteries of the glory of Mary's name, in his customary way with lists, and made use of a few extracts from Article I (*Qualiter sancti prophetae gloriam nominis Mariae praedixerunt*), which enumerates and explains the Old Testament figurative representations of the name of Mary. From Article II (*De cognominationibus dignissimis*, *quibus in Scriptura Maria nominatur*) he took the list of seven epithets ascribed to Mary in the Bible: *amica*, *soror*, *filia*, *sponsa*, *virgo*, *mulier*, and *regina*. However, he or his copyist missed out the paragraph from the original on the fifth appellative, *virgo*; the sequence in the Toruń manuscript runs, "Fourth, she is called the bride… Sixth, she is called the woman…" ("Czwarte rzeczona oblubienica… Szoste rzeczona niewiasta…"). Another list in the Polish text, of seven reasons why Mary should be called Queen, also has its prototype in Pelbárt's Article II. The last of these reasons ("The eleventh benefit drawn from calling on the name of Mary is the cooling of the fire of purgatory…" – "Siodme dla ukoronowania… a na głowie jej korona z gwiazd dwanaście") is followed in the Polish version by a prayer which does not occur in the original but perhaps was added by the copyist. The prayer reads, "May it please God to let us look upon that wondrous crown. Amen. Jesus and Mary" ("Daj, Boże, byśmy tę

tak dziwną koronę oglądali. Amen. Jezus, Maryja"; P 132r). Paterek evidently decided to end the sermon on the Name of Mary at this point, although the original continues with examples to illustrate the Name's power, a prayer to conclude Article II, and subsequently Article III presenting the twelve privileges of the name of the Virgin Mary.

Sermon V. [On the Most Holy Life of the Virgin Mary]

As with the previous sermon, the heading I have given above is my translation of the title of Book VII of the *Stellarium*, *De sanctissima vita Beatae Mariae*, from which Paterek took some passages. In the Toruń manuscript it appears on f.132r–154v, and begins with the sentence "It is written in the first chapter of Proverbs, Son, do not forsake your mother's law, so that grace may flow upon your head" ("Napisano w Przepowieściach pierwego kapitulum: Synu, nie opuszczaj zakonu matki twej, chceszli, aby-ć dana łaska głowie twej", P 132r–132v), which is in perfect correspondence with the subject of Part One of Pelbárt's seventh sermon: "Fili, ne dimittas legem matris tuae, addata gratia capiti tuo. Prover. I. ca." (SC mv). This sentence opens Paterek's sermon on the life of Our Lady, which has been compiled from passages drawn from Articles I–III of the Pelbárt sermon. Paterek applies a few extracts from the introduction to Part One of Pelbárt's sermon, from his Article I (*Quare evangelistae noluerunt de vita Beatae Mariae scribere*, *aut de eius morte et similibus*), large chunks of Article II (*Quare Beata Maria in sua vita suscipere debuit et de facto suscepit omnia Ecclesiae sacramenta*), and almost the whole of Article III (*De regulis sanctitatis*, *quas singulas et omnes in summa perfectione observavit Beata Maria quandiu vixit*). Paterek ends his sermon at the end of Pelbárt's Part One; he ignores the whole of the two remaining parts.

The final paragraph of Paterek's sermon is interesting and deserves special attention. It is probably an addition made either by himself or his copyist:

> Here I have written down for you the holy rules the Virgin Mary observed in her life, asking and requiring you [ladies] to follow her in this, for you [ladies] should at all times be capable of more, be better, and dispense more acts of mercy. Here is some instruction for you, an example of how to attain to sanctity, and an example of and reason for the dispensing of good deeds of mercy – a great example presented in the life of the Virgin Mary, and of this prince and people. Wherefore I ask for a Hail Mary, so that the Virgin may help me keep those rules of holiness. Amen.
>
> Żywot reguł tych świętych Maryjej Panny tum wam wypisał, chcąc a tego po was żądając, byście jej w tym naśladowały, boście na kożdy czas powinne więcej umieć, lepszymi być, więcej uczynkow miłosiernych czynić. Tu naukę macie, przykład ku świątości, przykład i powod ku dobrym miłosiernym uczynkom; z tego Panny Maryjej żywota i tego książęcia, i tego luda wielki macie przykład. Gdzie też proszę o Zdrową Maryją, by też ta Panna mnie wspomogła k tej regule takiej świątości. Amen (P 154v).

The ejaculation inscribed below, "Jezus, Maryja, Anna, Agnes, Franciscus" – a sequence of names characteristic of Franciscan spirituality, suggests that Paterek's exhortation and request may have been addressed to the Observantine nuns of Kraków, for whom in the latter half of the 15th century Hińcza of Rogów, Lord Castellan of Sandomierz, established a small convent, St. Agnes', in the Stradom suburb of Kraków (DOBROWOLSKI 1906).

Another noteworthy passage in Paterek's sermon on the life of Mary is the paragraph on "marital holiness", viz. the sacrament of matrimony Mary contracted with Joseph. Pelbárt deliberates on the issue whether Mary received all the sacraments in Article II of Part One of his seventh sermon. Paterek follows him faithfully up to the point where he discusses Mary's marriage: "Quinto de sacramento matrimonii quaestium locum non habet, quia constat ex evangelio, quae fuit desponsata Ioseph et fuit verum matrimonium, sicut patuit in li. I, parte. VI, ar. 3, c. 1" (SC m_3v).

Pelbárt considers the subject closed, as he has already discussed it at length in Book I of the *Stellarium coronae* (on the Annunciation), to which he refers his readers. However, Paterek does not stop at a mechanical translation of Pelbárt's cross-reference, but actually goes back to the passage in Book I and translates it here (SC d_4r; P 138–138v).

This apparently minor detail allows us to conclude that Paterek did not translate Pelbárt's work mechanically. He was an attentive editor, striving to make the Polish translation logical and coherent. Furthermore, he must have had access to the full edition of the *Stellarium coronae*, referring whenever necessary to other parts of the work outside Books IV–VII, which made up the basis of his translation. Thirdly, since he went back to Pelbárt's Book I and extracted the passage indicated by Pelbárt, inserting it in his Polish version of the sermon on the life of Mary, which was based on Pelbárt's Book VII, we may infer that Paterek neither translated nor intended to translate the whole of Pelbárt's opus.

* * *

A scrupulous comparative analysis of the two texts will be required before we are able to make a definitive statement on the dependence of the Polish Paterek sermons on the *Stellarium coronae* of Pelbárt of Temesvár. However, what can be said already now is that Paterek's work is certainly not a full, continuous translation of the *Stellarium*. As a translator, Paterek makes use of Pelbárt's model sermons in line with the recommendations of the *ars predicandi* and may be treated rather as the editor of his own, Polish version of the model. He makes an independent selection of the material, trying to compile a logical and coherent discourse keeping to the subject of his sermon and its intended application. Sometimes he translates long passages of the *Stellarium*; at other times he fishes out isolated sentences from the Latin text to present his principal theses, omitting their elaborations, discussion, and the details of the arguments for and against them. One of the categories he omits or passes over in silence are Pelbárt's references to the

sources and authorities, e.g. Aristotle's *Ethics* and *Topics*, the *Topics* of Boethius, St. Anselm, Franciscus Maronis, or the digests of civil (Justinian and Ulpian) and canon law.

On the other hand, the Polish translator also appends the text with his own, fairly short explications, occasionally marked by an adaptive originality; he expands quotes from the Scriptures; and he introduces his own prayers. There are many places in the translation where phenomena of this type occur; I shall limit myself to describing a few examples from two of his sermons, On the Conception of the Pure Virgin Mary and On the Nativity of the Virgin Mary.

One of the most interesting examples of this kind in the former homily occurs in a passage on the debate on the Immaculate Conception held in the University of Paris, concluding with Duns Scotus' position. In the *Stellarium coronae* Pelbárt writes, "Et idipsum tenent nunc nostri doctores, videlicet Lyra, Franciscus Maronis, Petrus de Candia, Aureolus, Guilhelmus Varro et multi alii" (SC b_8r). Sensing that a list of foreign-sounding names of Franciscan theologians, students and disciples of Duns Scotus, would not be very meaningful to his congregations, Paterek employs the tactic of domestication, and writes "which is now followed by every school of learning, including our Cracovian learning, too" ("którego już się każda nauka trzyma i tak, jako on, uznawa i nasza nauka krakowska"; P 11v–12r). Paterek's domestication was successful enough to evade the notice of Lucjan Malinowski, who treated this passage as the key evidence for the originality of the sermons in the Toruń codex (Malinowski 1880: 8).

Another example of Paterek's creative streak occurs in Sermon I when he paraphrases a sentence from Pelbárt on seven reasons why the Blessed Virgin is worthy of veneration, after an account of the views of the adversaries of the doctrine of the immaculate conception, which have been anathemised by the pope. In Pelbárt the sentence runs "Unde, ut fideles magis inducantur ad huius praeservationis piam credulitatem, septem rationes hic ponemus, quibus id declaratur" (SC l_4v). Paterek renders it in Polish as "Therefore, to encourage us to espouse piety and believe that what I have written is true I shall adduce seven reasons to bring [us] to venerate her seven joys" ("A przeto byśmy się ku nabożeństwu pobudzili a ku wierze przyszli, iż to prawda, com napisał, siedmią wywodów tego dowieść chcę ku czci jej siedmi radości"; P 13r). Evidently, Paterek must have found a straightforward translation of this passage insufficient. Not only did he use the first person singular to personalise the message, but he went further, combining the seven reasons with the Seven Joys of the Virgin – a Marian devotion which was becoming more and more popular in Poland at the turn of the 15th and 16th centuries, cultivated chiefly by the Franciscans of the Strict Observance (cf. Kopeć 1997: 336–340).

In his version of the sermon on the Virgin's birth, Paterek appends a sentence to the conclusion of the translation of Article I of Part One of Pelbárt's homily, writing, "…grateful for this and venerating her on this account let us all say with Christ, Amen" ("…z czego wdzięczni będąc a cześć jej z tego czyniąc, rzeczmy wszytcy z Krystem: Amen"; P 92v). Paterek (or his copyist) adds the ejaculation

"Jezus, Maryja" at the bottom of f.117r. When Pelbárt mentions those who do not acknowledge the doctrine of the immaculate conception, writing "Ubi nota, quod si loquimur secundum modum illorum, qui tenent, quod Beata Virgo fuerit concepta in peccato originali…" (SC kv) his Polish translator renders the mention in a far more concrete manner: "as is sometimes claimed by the stubborn monks who refuse to accept the doctrine of Mary being kept free from sin" ("acz tu niekiedy mają potwierdzenie uporni zakonnicy, którzy się przeciwią zachowaniu od grzechu…"; P 95r) – thereby making it plain he means the Dominicans, who were not in favour of immaculatism.

Occasionally Paterek's creativity manifests itself in his embellishment of particular passages with new contents. For example, when Pelbárt writes of Mary's universal glory, "Unde omnes eam venerabantur singulari affectu et laus eius diffundebatur ubique…" (SC lv), Paterek elaborates with a paraphrase: "Therefore everyone venerated and loved her, heeding her with singular affection, spreading abroad the glory of her virtue far and wide like the fame of the Sybils" ("Przeto wszytcy ją czcili, miłowali i osobliwą chęcią się jej bali, tak, iż się o jej cnocie chwała rozlała była jako o Sybillach"; P 122v). Paterek also made editorial amendments, not only at the beginning and at the end of his sermons, but also in places corresponding to the internal transitions between successive parts and articles in Pelbárt's Latin text. One such point which I have already discussed occurs on f.115v in the sermon on the Virgin's birth, at the transition from Part One to Part Two of Pelbárt's sermon.

* * *

Can the discovery of the Latin source of the sermons in the Toruń codex throw new light on the circumstances in which they were composed? It certainly can, though more work will be needed to compare the two homiletic collections – Pelbárt's and Paterek's. What we can say with absolute certainly is that the only copy we know of Paterek's sermons does not contain the entirety of his work. At least the opening, and probably quite extensive, part of his sermon on the Blessed Name of the Virgin Mary is missing, perhaps along with several other passages from the original. The copyist of the Toruń codex was transcribing a manuscript which was incomplete to start with, moreover he transcribed it in a fairly mechanical way. He had problems in finding his way around the contents and composition of the successive sermons, and the confusing jumble of arguments.

Furthermore, the identification of Pelbárt's *Stellarium coronae* as the source for Paterek's Sermon I (*O poczęciu Maryjej Panny Czystej*) and also Sermon III (*O narodzeniu Maryjej Panny* – or in fact the three separate sermons described above), previously attributed to Paterek confirms Maria Karpluk's hypothesis that Sermons I and III in the Toruń codex were written by the same author. The author of Sermon II was another person, who did not use the *Stellarium coronae*.

We may now attempt to answer the question put by Aleksander Brückner with more confidence. Brückner's speculation went as follows:

> Thus: is Paterek's set of homilies a finished work? No; evidently he intended to compile a full *Mariale*, a series of sermons for each of the Marian feasts (perhaps several for each feast), arranged in chronological order. He started from her Conception (with two sermons) and went on to her Nativity (one sermon), but broke off – perhaps arrested by his sudden death, or maybe (though less likely) he abandoned the project, or perhaps the manuscript of the continuation was lost or not available to the copyist. After the sermons for the Conception and Nativity one should definitely have expected sermons for the Annunciation, etc. (BRÜCKNER 1900: 77).

The point I have made above – that in his sermon on the Most Holy Life of the Virgin Mary Paterek availed himself of a passage on the twofold perfection of Mary's marriage, which he drew from Pelbárt's first sermon following the instruction given in the latter's seventh sermon – may suggest that Paterek did not intend to compile a full *Mariale*. If he had translated or intended to translate Pelbárt's first sermon (on the Annunciation) as well he would not have gone back to reiterate the passage in question in his sermon on Mary's Name but only referred back to it, just as Pelbárt had done.

Paterek's idea must have been somewhat different, as hinted by the selection of topics in the sermons transcribed in the Toruń codex. The focus is on the doctrine of Mary's Immaculate Conception, which was a hotly debated subject at the time. It is strictly connected with the question of the birth or coming into the world of the Immaculate Mother of God, conceived without original sin. These two mysteries lead to the subsequent topics: Mary's glory and veneration, her spiritual and physical beauty, the power of her name and the advantages to be drawn from calling upon her name, and the imitation of Mary's chastity and sinless life. Paterek found all these subjects in Books IV–VII of the *Stellarium coronae* and based his compilation on them.

Moreover, there is a patent tendency in the sermons of Paterek, especially in his last one, to treat Mary's life and character as a model to be imitated, particularly by nuns. The fullest expression of this trend comes in the individualised conclusion to the sermon on the Most Holy Life of the Virgin Mary. This authorial addendum permits us to put the question whether Paterek was addressing his collection of Marian sermons based on translations from Books IV–VII of the *Stellarium coronae* (a work published shortly before, almost contemporary with its Polish translation) to a community of virgins, nuns belonging to a Franciscan order but not understanding Latin, or more specifically, to the Observantine Franciscan nuns of Kraków.

Finally, there is the question of the time interval in which the Paterek Sermons were written. Conventionally, it is believed to have been 1504–1518, in other words, the period from his graduation with the master's degree to the date of his murder. The identification of the Latin prototype of the Paterek Sermons, which has established that they were not an original creation penned by Jan of Szamotuły while at the same time testifying to his extensive reading and theological erudition, in my opinion, gives the grounds for a conjecture that they may have been composed already during Master Paterek's novitiate with the Observantines, that

is 1505–1506.[10] The addition at the end of Sermon I marking the end of Doctor Paterek's sermon ("Już się dokonało kazanie doktora Paterka") was written in by a person who revised the manuscript (MALINOWSKI 1880: 5), so it has no bearing on the date of the sermon's completion. The author's connection with the Cracovian community of Observantine nuns, disclosed in his dedication to them at the end of the last sermon of "the life of the Virgin Mary and the holy rules observed therein" and his request for prayers on his behalf for the grace to keep those rules in his own life would perhaps also speak for an early dating within the interval.

Perhaps the manuscript, or even the autograph of the sermons of Paterek was discovered in the house of the Cracovian Observantine monks after its author's death. One of the order's scribes could have been asked to make a copy, which was then proof-read by a senior member of the order. The manuscript which was used to make the copy may well have been incomplete by that time, and the scribe supplemented the Pelbárt/Paterek sermons on the Immaculate Conception with another, much longer sermon on the same subject, which would probably have also been based on Latin sources but was not as learned or well-arranged and, as all the evidence suggests, was not the handiwork of Master Paterek, Jan of Szamotuły.

References

ÁDÁM 2008 = ÁDÁM Edina: *Pelbárt of Themesvar and the Use of Images in Preaching*. MA Thesis in Medieval Studies. Budapest, 2008. www.etd.ceu.hu/2008/adam_edina.pdf. [Accessed: 20 March 2013.]

ADAMCZYK 1980 = ADAMCZYK Maria: *Biblijno-apokryficzne narracje w literaturze staropolskiej do końca XVI wieku*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 1980.

BORGNET 1898 = BORGNET Auguste, BORGNET Émile (ed.): Albertus Magnus: *De laudibus Beatae Mariae Virginis libri duodecim*. Paris: apud Ludovicum Vivès, 1898.

BRACHA 2007 = BRACHA Krzysztof: *Nauczanie kaznodziejskie w Polsce późnego średniowiecza. Sermones dominicales et festivales z tzw. kolekcji Piotra z Miłosławia*. Kielce: Wydawnictwo Akademii Świętokrzyskiej, 2007.

BRÜCKNER 1900 = BRÜCKNER Aleksander: *Apokryfy średniowieczne*. (Rozprawy Wydziału Filologicznego 28.) Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 1900.

CHMIEL–ŻEGOTA 1887 = CHMIEL Adam, ŻEGOTA Pauli et al. (ed.): *Album studiosorum Universitatis Cracoviensis* 1. *Ab Anno 1400 ad Annum 1489*. Cracoviae: Universitas Jagellonica, 1887.

DOBROWOLSKI 1906 = DOBROWOLSKI Marceli N. *Kościół i klasztor św. Agnieszki w Krakowie*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Miłośników Historii i Zabyków Krakowa, 1906.

FIJAŁEK 1900 = FIJAŁEK Jan: Nasza nauka krakowska o Niepokalanym Poczęciu Najświętszej Panny Maryi w wiekach średnich. *Przegląd Polski* 136 (1900): 420–485.

FRANKOWSKA 1999 = *Księdza Jana z Szamotuł Paterkiem zwanego kazanie O poczęciu Maryjej Panny Czystej* (*ok. 1525*). Transkrypcja tekstu, komentarze i słowniczek Maria Frankowska. Toruń: Towarzystwo Bibliofilów im. Joachima Lelewela, 1999.

GĄSIOROWSKI 2000 = GĄSIOROWSKI Antoni et al. (red.) *Księga promocji Wydziału Sztuk Uniwersytetu Krakowskiego z XV wieku*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2000.

[10] Michałowska has also suggested a date as early as this (MICHAŁOWSKA 1995: 627).

KARPLUK 1958 = KARPLUK Maria: Zagadnienia autorstwa tzw. Kazań Paterka. *Zeszyty Naukowe UJ. Filologia* 4. *Prace Językoznawcze* 2 (1958): 79–91.

KARPLUK 2010 = KARPLUK Maria: *Staropolskie studia językoznawcze*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności, 2010.

KĘTRZYŃSKI 1874 = KĘTRZYŃSKI Wojciech: X. doktor Paterek. *Rozprawy i Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń Wydziału Filologicznego Akademii Umiejętności* 1 (1874): 119–124.

KOPEĆ 1997 = KOPEĆ Jerzy J. *Bogarodzica w kulturze polskiej XVI wieku*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw KUL, 1997.

KOSZTOLNYIK 1967 = KOSZTOLNYIK Zoltán: Pelbártus of Temesvár: A Franciscan Preacher and Writer of the Late Middle Ages in Hungary. *Vivarium. A Journal for Mediaeval Philosophy and the Intellectual Life of the Middle Ages* 1967/3: 100–110.

KOSZTOLNYIK 1988 = KOSZTOLNYIK Zoltán: Some Hungarian Theologians in the Late Renaissance. *Church History* 1988/1: 5–18.

MALINOWSKI 1880 = MALINOWSKI Lucjan: Magistra Jana z Szamotuł, dekretów doktora, Paterkiem zwanego, kazania o Maryi Pannie Czystej z kodeksu toruńskiego. *Sprawozdania Komisji Językowej Akademii Umiejętności* 1 (1880): 161–294.

MICHAŁOWSKA 1995 = MICHAŁOWSKA Teresa: *Średniowiecze*. Warszawa: PWN, 1995.

MICHAŁOWSKA 2011 = MICHAŁOWSKA Teresa: *Literatura polskiego średniowiecza. Leksykon*. Warszawa: PWN, 2011.

MUCZKOWSKI 1849 = MUCZKOWSKI Józef (red.): *Statuta nec non liber promotionum philosophorum ordinis in Universitate studiorum Iagellonica ab anno 1402 ad annum 1849*. Cracoviae: Typis Universitatis, 1849.

NK 1965 = POLLAK Roman, WITCZAK Tadeusz et al. (red.) *Bibliografia literatury polskiej „Nowy Korbut"*. T. 3. *Piśmiennictwo staropolskie*: *hasła osobowe N–Ż*. Warszawa: PIW, 1965.

PELBARTUS DE THEMESWAR 1505 = PELBARTUS DE THEMESWAR: *Stellarium coronae Benedictae Mariae Virginis in laudem eius pro singulis praedicationibus elegantissime coaptatum*. Hagenau: Henricus Gran pro Johannes Rynmann, 1505.

ROUSE 1979 = ROUSE Richard H., ROUSE Mary A. *Preachers. Florilegia and Sermons*: *Studies on the "Manipulus florum" of Thomas of Ireland*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1979.

RZEPKA–WYDRA 1984 = RZEPKA Wojciech R., WYDRA Wiesław (red.): *Chrestomatia staropolska. Teksty do roku 1543*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1984.

RZEPKA–WYDRA 1996 = RZEPKA Wojciech R., WYDRA Wiesław (red.): *Cały świat nie pomieściłby ksiąg. Staropolskie opowieści i przekazy apokryficzne*. Introduction by Maria Adamczyk. Warszawa–Poznań: PWN, 1996.

SZILÁDY 1880 = SZILÁDY Áron: *Temesvári Pelbárt élete és munkái*. Budapest: Franklin Társulat, 1880.

TASZYCKI 1962–1963 = TASZYCKI Witold: Jan z Szamotuł. In: *Polski słownik biograficzny*. T. 10. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1962–1963. 482–483.